

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/438,247	11/12/1999	JUNJI NISHIGAKI	15162/01290	9067
24367 75	90 1 1/01/2006		EXAMINER	
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP			KASSA, YOSEF	
717 NORTH HA	ARWOOD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX	75201		2624	
			DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/438,247	NISHIGAKI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	YOSEF KASSA	2624	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence addr	ess
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION (136(a)). In no event, however, may a rewill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become AE	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this comm ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 A	August 2006		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		ers, prosecution as to the m	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under I			•
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application	1.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6-16</u> is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 5</u> is/are rejected.		•	
7) Claim(s) <u>4</u> is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 1999 is/a	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□	objected to by the Examine	er.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correc			1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-	152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority document			
2. Certified copies of the priority document		·	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio		received in this National Sta	age
application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	raccived	
Coc the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified copies not	eceiveu.	
Attachment(s)	 .		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date	
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of In	formal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	<u> </u>	

Application/Control Number: 09/438,247 Page 2

Art Unit: 2624

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments/amendment see the remark on page 2-4, filed on 08/14, 2006, with respect to rejections of claims 1-16 have been fully considered and are persuasive. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made on Mita et al (U.S. Patent 5,692,210), and further in view of Simpson et al (U.S. Patent 6,185,629).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mita et al (U.S. Patent 5,692,210), and further in view of Simpson et al (U.S. Patent 6,185,629).

With regard to claim 1, Mita et al disclose a plurality of processors (please refer to item 1603, in Fig. 30, comprises multiple processors, also refer to col. 17, lines 62-67) processing respective portions of the same input image data (please refer to col. 2, lines 28-36, note that block selected from the same input image data) in parallel with each other (please refer to col. 2, lines 41-45) and outputting respective processed portions of said input image data (please refer to Fig. 39, note that the output from processor unit is input to memory); and

an address memory (accepting) and storing address information related to a position of each portion of said input image data within said input image data for each respective portion of image data which have been processed by said plurality of processors (please refer to col. 2, lines 46-60 and also refer to col. 18, lines 1-8 and also).

Mita et al did not disclose expressly for an address memory accepting process. However, at the same field of endeavor, Simpson discloses this feature (please refer to col. 12, lines 50-60, which reads on the process of controller 80 controlling accessing memory activities). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching Simpson memory controlling process into Mita parallel processing system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide controlling the memory so that the memory area in the memory is accessed according to controller 80 (please refer to col. 12, lines 50-60 of Simpson). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Simpson with Mita to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With regard to claim 2, Mita et al disclose an image memory storing said image data output from said plurality of processors (please refer to Fig. 30, items 1603 and 1602, the output from processors 1603 is stored in memory 1602, also refer to col. 17, lines 62-67), and read means reading (scanning) said image data from said image memory on the basis of said address information stored in said address memory (please refer to col. 18, lines 65-col. 19, lines 5).

Art Unit: 2624

With regard to claim 3, Mita et al disclose further comprising an image memory storing said image data output from said plurality of processors along the sequence of addresses on the basis of said address information stored in said address memory (please refer to col. 19, lines 1-18).

With regard to claim 5, Mita et al disclose wherein said plurality of processors also output arrangement information corresponding to said processed portions of said image data (please refer to col. 19, lines 15-25).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 6-16 are allowed.
- 4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance. The closest prior art of record failed to teach or suggest, a first memory accepting and storing arrangement information in single image data for plurality of divided data arrangement information for each of said plurality of divided data being associated with whichever processor performs the prescribed processing of the divided data; and a controller restoring a single image from plurality of data processed in said plurality of processors in accordance with said arrangement information. Therefore, in combination with all the other limitations claims 6-16 are allowable.
- 5. Claims 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Other Prior Art Cited

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. (6233361), (6188693), (6188440) and (5887079).

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOSEF KASSA whose telephone number is (571) 272-7452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on (571) 272-7778. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communication and (571) 273-8300 for after Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number: 09/438,247

Art Unit: 2624

Page 6

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PATENT EXAMINER

Yosef Kassa

10/29/2006.